DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 321 385 EA 022 033

AUTHOR Hess, Fritz
TITLE A Study of the Impact of Educational Reform Movements.
PUB DATE Nov 89
NOTE 37p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Administrator Role; *Educational Change; Educational Environment; *Educational Innovation; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *School Restructuring

ABSTRACT

An assessment of the relative and absolute impact of various educational reform movements on student learning and an analysis of school superintendents' roles in such movements are the purposes of this study. Mailed surveys to 70 experienced New York school superintendents yielded a 78.6 percent response rate. The first phase focused on the individual impacts of 10 recent educational reform movements, and the second phase compared the movements with each other with respect to student learning and the role of the superintendency. Findings indicate that the perceptions of the value of recent educational reform movements vary widely. Approaches with specific target populations were viewed as having the most impact on student learning, and those with less structure and definition were perceived as having little impact. A conclusion is that although reform efforts may have some value, the real work of education lies in addressing specific problems at the district level. Twenty-two summary tables of survey findings are included. (12 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED321385

A Study of the Impact of Educational Reform Movements

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Hess

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

By
Fritz Hess, Superintendent
East Syracuse-Minoa Central Schools
East Syracuse, New York 13057

November 1989

EA 022 033

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The 1960s also saw the appearance of the open education schools movement, which involved the development of classrooms without walls and reductions in the compartmentalization of school environments. The open education approach was also fostered by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.[6]

With the coming of the 1980s, the Back to Basics movement developed as a reaction to the extremes of free form education during the 1970s. Unlike its predecessors which challenged traditional curricula and methods, the Back to Basics movement affirmed the value of lecture, homework, and rote learning. Although this effort addressed all subject areas, it tended to focus on the so-called basic subject areas, language arts (especially the English language) and mathematics.[7]

During the 1970s, a focus on providing equal educational opportunities to all students continued with the development of curricula and programs for the handicapped. In 1966, Congress had established a Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. This was followed in the 1970s by a series of court decisions which affirmed the rights of handicapped persons to education and the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act by Congress in 1975. These efforts encouraged the development of laws and regulations concerning the handicapped by state governments and an outpouring of programming for students at the local level.[8]

Paralleling the development of curricula for handicapped students in the 1970s was the evolution of programs for the gifted and talented. The gifted and talented movement provided renewed attention for the needs of advanced students. It involved a range of different subject areas and different approaches, such as instruction within regular classrooms and special, "pull-out" classes.[9]

With the coming of the 1980s, renewed concern over the education of all American students appeared in the Effective Schools Movement. This effort developed out of a series of studies which identified characteristics associated with improvements in the achievement of students in Michigan schools. The movement focused on the development of academic emphasis, skills of teachers, instructional behaviors, rewards and punishments, student climate, student responsibility and participation, and staff responsibility and participation as means of increasing the academic performance and improving the education of all students in a full range of subject areas.[10]

The 1980s also witnessed the development of the so-called Great Reform Movement. Originating in the 1983 report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk, and a number of similar documents, the Great Reform Movement

emphasized increases in regulatory standards and graduation requirements as means of increasing the quality and the rigor of education in the schools.[11]

During the past four decades, the impact and lack of impact of educational reform movements has been widely debated. The results of these discussions have covered a wide spectrum. Reform movements have been praised as instruments of progress and improvement and condemned as superficial outlets for professional and public concern. The content of reform movements has been dissected and compared; the language of these movements analyzed.[12]

Exhaustive, or more accurately, exhausting as recent discussions of reform movements have been, they have generally been confined to academic circles outside local school districts. There is nothing terribly wrong with this. Movements in education need to be evaluated in colleges, universities, and government circles. The problem with such activity, however, is that it has frequently become widely divorced from the arena where all of the so-called educational reform movements are designed to have their principal impact, the classrooms, other school facilities, and homes which comprise local school communities. Unfortunately, the reams of literature which have been generated concerning reform in education contain very little in the way of serious efforts to analyze the impact of this area on student learning.

This study represented an initial effort to fill this gap in current research and literature. It involved the sampling of the opinion of experienced superintendents of schools in a number of New York State school districts regarding the impact of a full range of educational reform movements. Efforts were made to assess the impact of these movements on an absolute scale, as well as to compare their relative impact. The study also included an attempt to assess the role of the superintendent of schools in the development of reform movements at the district level. Through this approach, the study encouraged thought and evaluation concerning the actual impact of educational reform movements.

Method

The study sampled the opinions of experienced superintendents of schools in New York State school districts regarding the impact of reform movements. Efforts were made to include individuals with experience in superintendency spanning at least a decade.

Attempts were also made to include persons with more than a decade in the profession, so that the study would be based on direct contact with as many reform movements as possible.

Data collected through the survey focused on the following educational reform movements, identified through a review of available literature.

Comprehensive High School Movement
Post Sputnik Emphasis on the Sciences
Discovery Approach
Programs for the Disadvantaged
Open Education
Back to Basics Movement
Education of the Handicapped
Gifted and Talented Movement
Effective Schools Movement
Great Reform Movement of the 1980s

With respect to each of these movements, the opinions of study participants concerning two variables were sampled. The primary study variable was the impact of the movement on student learning, identified as either profound, moderate, or slight positive impact, no impact (positive or negative), slight, moderate, or profound negative impact, or no opinion. The extent to which superintendency was instrumental to the success of each movement was also sampled as the profession being instrumental, contributing somewhat, not influencing (positively or negatively), or negatively influencing each movement. Ample space was also included for participants to provide written comments concerning each movement.

These questions were listed on a survey form which was mailed to a sample of 70 experienced superintendents of schools in New York State during May 1989. By July 1989, 43 responses (61.4 percent of the total) had been received. During August 1989, a follow-up mailing including a second copy of the form was sent to those who had not responded to the initial request. By September 1989, 12 additional forms had been received. The final data set included 55 participants (78.6 percent of those originally contacted).

Analysis of the study data involved simple descriptive statistics for the survey items and summarization of written comments. In the initial phase of the analysis, frequencies and percentages of responses were identified for the item which related to the impact of each reform movement on student learning and the role of superintendency in each

movement. These data were also compared with written comments concerning each movement. In the second phase of the analysis, quantitative and written responses concerning all of the reform movements with respect to student learning and the role of superintendency were compared. Throughout the analysis, emphasis was placed on the impact of reform movements on student learning as the major study variable.

Results

Before the actual results of the study were analyzed, personal and professional data concerning the respondents were evaluated. This information indicated that the mean age of participants was 51.39 years, while the median age was 53.00 years. The data showed that the mean number of years in superintendency for respondents was 15.42, while the median was 16.00. The data also indicated that the mean number of years in current superintendencies for participants was 8.75, while the median was 8.00. This information demonstrated that the study participants included an experienced group of professionals who should have had extensive experience with the reform movements being evaluated. The fact that mean and median age and experience levels for these individuals were nearly identical suggested that the distribution of these variables within the study population was approximately normal.

The initial phase of the study analysis focused on each individual reform movement. The results of the analysis concerning each movement follow.

Comprehensive High School Movement

Results of the initial analysis concerning the Comprehensive High School Movement are summarized in Tables 1 and 2 at the end of this narrative. The data in Table 1 indicated that the largest single group of respondents (40.0 percent of the total) believed that this approach had a moderate positive impact on student results. All but 12.7 percent of respondents indicated that this movement had produced a positive impact of some type. The data in Table 2 demonstrated that most respondents felt that superintendency had contributed somewhat to the success of this approach.

Respondents provided a range of verbal comments concerning the Comprehensive High School Movement. One superintendent praised the approach as generating, "profound changes for able students", however, another suggested that, "We needed main dishes, and Dr. Conant developed a buffet." Another was philosophical, "The greatest impact was in the cities, but I am too young to know."

Post Sputnik Emphasis on the Sciences

Results of the initial analysis concerning the post Sputnik emphasis on the sciences are summarized in Tables 3 and 4 at the end of this narrative. The data in Table 3 showed that the vast majority of respondents were evenly divided concerning whether this movement produced a profound or moderate positive impact. Less than 8 percent of participants indicated that this approach generated a negative impact or no impact. The information in Table 4 suggested that most respondents felt that superintendency contributed somewhat to the success of this movement.

Most written comments regarding the post Sputnik emphasis in the sciences were positive. One superintendent noted that programs associated with this effort were "excellent in providing content for teachers" and concluded that present problems in elementary science are caused, "in great part, by teachers' lack of content understanding." At the same time, however, one superintendent characterized the impact of this approach as "really a short term change."

The Discovery Approach

Results of the initial analysis concerning the Discovery Approach are summarized in Tables 5 and 6 at the end of the narrative. This information demonstrated that the largest single group of respondents (36.4 percent) believed that this movement produced only a slight positive impact. Although a majority of the participants suggested that the Discovery Approach had generated some type of positive impact, over 25 percent indicated that it had no impact or a negative impact. The data in Table 6 showed that most respondents believed that superintendency had contributed somewhat to the successes attained by this movement.

Written comments regarding the Discovery Approach were mixed. One superintendent wrote, "It was profoundly positive for the more capable students but not necessarily for all students." Another suggested, (Its) negative impact may be because of our inability to comprehend and implement." Another was negative, "This was the beginning of the loss of respect for public education and public educators."

Programs for the Disadvantaged

Results of the initial analysis concerning Programs for the Disadvantaged are summarized in Tables 7 and 8 at the end of the narrative. The data in Table 7 indicates that the largest single group of respondents believed that these efforts produced a

moderate impact. Less than 5 percent of participants suggested that they generated a negative impact. The information in Table 8 showed that most study respondents believed that superintendency contributed somewhat to the success of these initiatives.

Written comments concerning Programs for the Disadvantaged were decidedly mixed. One superintendent wrote, "There was a major impact for those most in need", however, another suggested that, "Our intent to successfully educate minority and ethnic groups has failed miserably." Another concluded that, "The concept of equal opportunity is accepted but the problem is in the implementation of it particularly in the inner cities and rural areas."

Open Education

Results of the initial analysis concerning Open Education are summarized in Tables 9 and 10 at the end of the narrative. The data in Table 9 showed that less than one-third (32.7 percent) of respondents indicated that this approach produced some type of positive impact. The remaining two-thirds of the participants believed that it generated a negative impact or no impact. The information in Table 10 showed that the largest single group of respondents felt that superintendency contributed somewhat to the successes attained by this effort, however, another large group believed that superintendency did not influence this initiative.

All of the written comments regarding Open Education were negative. One superintendent wrote, "We allowed architects to dictate educational environment(s)." Another indicated that, "We are now "self-containing" all "open areas" in our district."

Back to Basics Movement

Results of the initial analysis concerning the Back to Basics Movement are summarized in Tables 11 and 12 at the end of the narrative. The data in Table 11 indicates that the largest single group of respondents (29.1 percent) believed that this approach had a moderate positive impact. At the same time, however, over 20 percent of participants believed it had no impact and 16.4 percent felt that it had a negative impact. The information in Table 12 showed that most respondents felt that superintendency contributed somewhat to this approach.

Written comments regarding the Back to Basics Movement were generally negative. One superintendent wrote that this approach "never left the barn", while another characterized the whole movement as "a reduction in program." Another superintendent

was more philosophical, noting that, "The movement itself was good. The negative aspects are in overemphasis."

Education of the Handicapped

Results of the initial analysis concerning the Education of the Handicapped are summarized in Tables 13 and 14 at the end of this narrative. The information in Table 13 demonstrated that a majority of respondents believed that this initiative had a profound positive impact. Less than 2 percent indicated that it had no impact or a negative impact. The data in Table 14 suggested that the largest single group of participants felt that superintendency contributed somewhat to the success of the effort.

Written comments regarding the Education of the Handicapped were generally positive. One superintendent concluded that, of all movements, this initiative produced the "greatest impact and change for students." Another noted that, "The positive impact was that students who were often "ignored" in the past were not receiving appropriate education." Written comments concerning this approach also included concerns. One superintendent indicated that, "Cost is becoming a burden to continued reform", while another suggested that, "the over regulation is incredible."

Gifted and Talented Movement

Results of the initial analysis concerning the Gifted and Talented Movement are summarized in Tables 15 and 16 at the end of this narrative. The information in Table 15 indicates that the largest single group of respondents (41.8 percent) believed that this approach had a moderate positive impact, although another relatively large group felt that it had only a slight positive impact. The data in Table 16 showed that most participants in the study believed that superintendency contributed somewhat to the success of this effort.

Written comments regarding the Gifted and Talented Movement raised questions concerning the impact of this approach. One superintendent wrote, "Hard to stand in the way of learning for the gifted and talented . . . not sure of long term benefit." Another indicated, "I have yet to see conclusive evidence that the Gifted and Talented Programs developed in public schools during the past ten years have had a positive impact on student learning."

Effective Schools Movement

Results of the initial analysis concerning the Effective Schools Movement are summarized in Tables 17 and 18 at the end of this narrative. The data in Table 17 indicate that the largest single group of respondents (41.8 percent) believed that this approach had a moderate positive impact on student learning. The information in Table 18 demonstrated that the largest single group of participants believed that superintendency contributed somewhat to the successes attained by this movement.

Verbal comments regarding the Effective Schools Movement were mixed. One superintendent concluded that, in schools with a history of outcome-based instruction, "there appears to be a positive impact on student learning.," Others were less positive. One superintendent indicated that, "This one is really not taking hold despite some shining examples", while another observed," The movement has failed to provide concrete, measurable change." Another superintendent suggested that evaluation of this movement may be premature, noting that "Good longitudinal data (are) not in yet."

Great Reform Movement of the 1980s

Results of the initial analysis concerning the Great Reform Movement of the 1980s are summarized in Tables 19 and 20 at the end of this narrative. The data in Table 19 indicated that the largest single group of study participants believed that this approach had only a slight positive impact on student learning. Over 14 percent of the respondents believed that this movement had no impact and another 16 percent felt that it had a negative impact on student learning. The information in Table 20 showed that the largest single group of participants (40.0 percent) felt that superintendency contributed somewhat to the successes attained by this approach, however, another large group (34.5 percent) concluded that superintendency did not influence the movement (positively or negatively).

Most verbal comments regarding the Great Reform Movement of the 1980s were negative. One superintendent indicated, "Different districts had most of this in place already. The cost for others and staffing (have) been difficult." Another observed that the Great Reform Movement was "simply a 'wimp' way to address the need for restructuring of public education." Another characterized the approach as "a political football played out in educational terms." Another superintendent cited a need for caution in evaluating this approach, noting that its long term effect (is) not known yet."

Comparison of Responses Concerning Reform Movements

The second phase of the analysis focused on comparison of the results of the study concerning the respective reform movements. This phase included both results which concerned the impact of the movements on student learning and the role of superintendency in the successes attained by these movements. Because of the importance of student learning in education, this portion of the analysis focused largely on that variable.

A comparison of the movements evaluated in the study according to the percentage of responses indicating a moderate or positive impact is summarized in Table 21 at the end of this narrative. The information in Table 21 demonstrates that the highest positive impact (70-100 percent of the responses) was produced by the Education of the Handicapped (89.1 percent), the Post Sputnik Emphasis on the Sciences (87.2 percent), and Programs for the Disadvantaged (70.9 percent). At the same time, the data indicated that the lowest degree of positive impact (0 - 40 percent of the responses) was produced by Open Education (10.9 percent), the Discovery Approach (36.4 percent), and the Back to Basics Movement (36.4 percent). It was notable that the highest positive impact was generated by focused approaches with limited populations, while the lowest positive impact was produced by open-ended approaches with less structure.

A comparison of the movements evaluated in the study according to the percentage of responses indicating slight or no impact is summarized in Table 22 at the end of this narrative. The information in Table 22 shows that the largest proportions of respondents indicating slight or no impact (60-100 percent) were produced by Open Education (89.1 percent) the Discovery Approach (61.8 percent), and the Back to Basics Movement (61.8 percent). At the same time, the smallest proportions of participants identifying slight or no impact (0 - 30 percent) were generated by the Education of the Handicapped (9.1 percent), the Post Sputnik Emphasis on the Sciences (11.0 percent), and Programs for the Disadvantaged (25.5 percent).

Verbal comments concerning specific reform movements, which were summarized in the initial phase of the analysis, generally reflected the results of these comparisons. Participants noted that the Education of the Handicapped and the Post Sputnik Emphasis on the Sciences, especially, produced a positive impact, although the costs of such results were sometimes questioned. Verbal comments regarding Open Education, the Discovery Approach, and the Back to Basics Movement were generally negative.

Additional written comments, provided at the end of the survey form, contained additional points regarding educational reform movements. Some of these comments emphasized that such approaches originated outside the local school district. One superintendent noted that, "there is always difficulty in internalizing the value and impact of movements which are superimposed from on high." Another observed that the vast majority of the movements identified in the survey were "externally generated." Verbal comments also emphasized the political character of a number of reform movements. One superintendent noted that many of these approaches have "politicized" education. Another concluded that "Reform movements seem to be more political than educational."

The second phase of the study also included evaluation of responses concerning the role of superintendency in reform movements. Comparison of responses to the survey item which concerned this subject was difficult, since most participants indicated that superintendency contributed somewhat. Among the reform movements, the proportion of participants indicating the superintendency was either instrumental or contributed somewhat ranged only from 43.7 to 78.2 percent.

Verbal comments concerning the role of superintendency in educational reform movements, provided at the end of the survey, contained additional information. Respondents emphasized the importance of the superintendent to the work of education. One respondent noted that, "in most districts, the superintendent is the key individual." At the same time, participants observed that most reform movements largely bypassed the superintendent. One participant noted that superintendents were forced to "react to major changes - whether they agree with the changes or not." Another suggested that educational change occurred through "superintendents working with building level administrators" rather than reform movements. The general tone of a number of these comments indicated that few superintendents viewed the reform movements as genuine instruments of positive change in education.

Conclusions

This study was a preliminary effort to evaluate the impact of educational reform movements on student learning and the role of superintendency in such movements in the United States. The study was based on a sample of the opinions of experienced superintendents in New York State.

The results of the study suggested that perceptions of the value of recent educational reform movements vary widely. Approaches with specific target populations,

such as the Education of the Handicapped and the Post Sputnik Emphasis on the Sciences, were viewed as having the greatest impact on student learning. Approaches with less structure and definition, such as Open Education and the Discovery Approach, were seen as having little impact on student learning.

Although most respondents viewed educational reform movements as having some type of positive impact, many responses to the survey were also characterized by skepticism regarding the value of these approaches. It appeared that a number of respondents would have agreed with John Meyer, who observed, "It is as if reform is the routine American way of doing educational business." [13] A number of participants who provided written comments saw the reform movements as efforts to use education for political purposes.

The results of the study appeared to suggest that, although reform movements may have some value, the real work of change in education lies in specific efforts to address particular problems. Reform movements which addressed these characteristics received the highest marks from survey participants. These sentiments reflect the thoughts of William Reid, Anne Lewis, and other authorities who have called for a restructuring of education based on genuine research in innovation at the district level.[14] The results of this study suggest that such efforts would contribute more to student learning than additional waves of reform movements.

References

1. Diane Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade: American Education 1945 - 1980. New York: Basic Books, 1983: 182-371.

2. Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade, p. 230

3. Ronald Podeschi and David Hackbarth, "The Cries for Excellence: Echoes from the Past", Educational Reform 50 (4) (Summer 1986): 420-425.

4. Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade, pp. 232-239.

5. Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade, p. 257.

   Peter W. Greenwood, Dale Mann, and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, III "The Process of Change. Santa Monica, Calif: The Rand Corporation, 1975: 83.

6. Ewald B. Nyquist and Gene R. Hawes (eds.), Open Education: A Sourcebook for Parents and Teachers. New York: Bantam Books, 1972: 83.

7. Karl L. Alexander and Aaron M. Pallas, "Curriculum Reform and School Performance: An Evaluation of the "New Basics", American Journal of Education 92 (4) (August 1984): 391-420.

8. Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade, pp. 307-309.

9. Fritz Hess, "A Study of Problems with Programs for Gifted and Talented Students in New York State School Districts," The Council Journal 7 (2) (May 1989): 55-57.

10. Arthur W. Steller, Effective Schools Research: Practice and Promise. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1988: 9-13;

    Glen E. Robinson, Effective Schools Research: A Guide to School Improvement. Arlington, Va.: Educational Research Service, 1985: 1-3.

11. J. Lynn Griesemer and Cornelius Butler, Education Under Study, An Analysis of Recent Major Reports on Education. Chelmsford, Mass.: Northeast Regional Exchange, 1983: 1-14;

    A. Harry Passow, "Tackling the Reform Reports of the 1980s," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (10) (June 1984): 674-683.

12. John Meyer, "Reform and Change", IFG Policy Notes 5 (4) (Fall 1984): 1-2;

    Podeschi and Hackbarth, "The Cries for Excellence: Echoes from the Past", pp. 419-432;

    William A. Reid, "Professional Education Reports and the Language of Reform", Educational Researcher 16 (8) (November 1987): 10-15.

13. Meyer, "Reform and Change", p. 2.

14. Reid, "Professional Education Reports and the Language of Reform", p. 10;

Anne Lewis, Restructuring America's Schools. Arlington, Va.: American Association of School Administrators, 1989: 139-247.

Table I

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
THE COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOL MOVEMENT

Impact of Movement on Student Learning	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Profound Positive Impact	15	27.3
Moderate Positive Impact	22	40.0
Slight Positive Impact	11	20.0
No Impact (Positive or Negative)	2	3.6
Slight Negative Impact	1	1.8
Moderate Negative Impact	0	0.0
Profound Negative Impact	0	0.0
No Opinion	4	7.3
Total	55	100.0

Table 2

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
THE COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOL MOVEMENT

Extent to Which Superintendency Influenced Movement	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Superintendency was instrumental to success of movement	10	18.2
Superintendency contributed somewhat to success of movement	31	56.4
Superintendency did not influence movement (positively or negatively)	6	10.9
Superintendency was a negative influence on movement	0	0.0
No Opinion	8	14.5
Total	55	100.0

Table 3

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
THE POST SPUTNIK EMPHASIS ON THE SCIENCES

Impact of Movement on Student Learning	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Profound Positive Impact	24	43.6
Moderate Positive Impact	24	43.6
Slight Positive Impact	4	7.3
No Impact (Positive or Negative)	1	1.8
Slight Negative Impact	0	0.0
Moderate Negative Impact	1	1.8
Profound Negative Impact	0	0.0
No Opinion	1	1.8
Total	55	99.9

Table 4

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
THE POST SPUTNIK EMPHASIS ON THE SCIENCES

Extent to Which Superintendency Influenced Movement	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Superintendency was instrumental to success of movement	11	20.0
Superintendency contributed somewhat to success of movement	30	54.5
Superintendency did not influence movement (positively or negatively)	7	12.7
Superintendency was a negative influence on movement	0	0.0
No Opinion	7	12.7
Total	55	99.9

Table 5

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
THE DISCOVERY APPROACH

Impact of Movement on Student Learning	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Profound Positive Impact	4	7.3
Moderate Positive Impact	16	29.1
Slight Positive Impact	20	36.4
No Impact (Positive or Negative)	6	10.9
Slight Negative Impact	5	9.1
Moderate Negative Impact	2	3.6
Profound Negative Impact	1	1.8
No Opinion	1	1.8
Total	55	100.0

Table 6

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
THE DISCOVERY APPROACH

Extent to Which Superintendency Influenced Movement	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Superintendency was instrumental to success of movement	1	1.8
Superintendency contributed somewhat to success of movement	30	54.5
Superintendency did not influence movement (positively or negatively)	14	25.5
Superintendency was a negative influence on movement	4	7.3
No Opinion	6	10.9
Total	55	100.0

Table 7

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Impact of Movement on Student Learning	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Profound Positive Impact	17	30.9
Moderate Positive Impact	22	40.0
Slight Positive Impact	11	20.0
No Impact (Positive or Negative)	2	3.6
Slight Negative Impact	0	0.0
Moderate Negative Impact	0	0.0
Profound Negative Impact	1	1.8
No Opinion	2	3.6
Total	55	99.9

Table 8

A SURVEY OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS IN NEW YORK STATE PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Extent to Which Superintendency Influenced Movement	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Superintendency was instrumental to success of movement	14	25.5
Superintendency contributed somewhat to success of movement	26	47.3
Superintendency did not influence movement (positively or negatively)	10	18.2
Superintendency was a negative influence on movement	1	1.8
No Opinion	4	7.3
Total	55	100.1

Table 9

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
OPEN EDUCATION

Impact of Movement on Student Learning	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Profound Positive Impact	1	1.8
Moderate Positive Impact	5	9.1
Slight Positive Impact	12	21.8
No Impact (Positive or Negative)	12	21.8
Slight Negative Impact	13	23.6
Moderate Negative Impact	11	20.0
Profound Negative Impact	1	1.8
No Opinion	0	0.0
Total	55	99.9

Table 10

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
OPEN EDUCATION

Extent to Which Superintendency Influenced Movement	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Superintendency was instrumental to success of movement	3	5.5
Superintendency contributed somewhat to success of movement	21	38.2
Superintendency did not influence movement (positively or negatively)	17	30.9
Superintendency was a negative influence on movement	10	18.2
No Opinion	4	7.3
Total	55	100.1

Table 11

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
THE BACK TO BASICS MOVEMENT

Impact of Movement on Student Learning	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Profound Positive Impact	4	7.3
Moderate Positive Impact	16	29.1
Slight Positive Impact	13	23.6
No Impact (Positive or Negative)	12	21.8
Slight Negative Impact	3	5.5
Moderate Negative Impact	5	9.1
Profound Negative Impact	1	1.8
No Opinion	1	1.8
Total	55	100.0

Table 12

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
THE BACK TO BASICS MOVEMENT

Extent to Which Superintendency Influenced Movement	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Superintendency was instrumental to success of movement	6	10.9
Superintendency contributed somewhat to success of movement	35	63.6
Superintendency did not influence movement (positively or negatively)	9	16.4
Superintendency was a negative influence on movement	2	3.6
No Opinion	3	5.5
Total	55	100.0

Table 13

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

Impact of Movement on Student Learning	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Profound Positive Impact	35	63.6
Moderate Positive Impact	14	25.5
Slight Positive Impact	4	7.3
No Impact (Positive or Negative)	0	0.0
Slight Negative Impact	0	0.0
Moderate Negative Impact	1	1.8
Profound Negative Impact	0	0.0
No Opinion	1	1.8
Total	55	100.0

Table 14

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

Extent to Which Superintendency Influenced Movement	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Superintendency was instrumental to success of movement	12	21.8
Superintendency contributed somewhat to success of movement	22	40.0
Superintendency did not influence movement (positively or negatively)	18	32.7
Superintendency was a negative influence on movement	2	3.6
No Opinion	1	1.8
Total	55	99.9

Table 15

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
THE GIFTED AND TALENTED MOVEMENT

Impact of Movement on Student Learning	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Profound Positive Impact	2	3.6
Moderate Positive Impact	23	41.8
Slight Positive Impact	21	38.2
No Impact (Positive or Negative)	6	10.9
Slight Negative Impact	1	1.8
Moderate Negative Impact	1	1.8
Profound Negative Impact	1	1.8
No Opinion	0	0.0
Total	55	99.9

Table 16

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
THE GIFTED AND TALENTED MOVEMENT

Extent to Which Superintendency Influenced Movement	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Superintendency was instrumental to success of movement	6	10.9
Superintendency contributed somewhat to success of movement	35	63.6
Superintendency did not influence movement (positively or negatively)	11	20.0
Superintendency was a negative influence on movement	3	5.5
No Opinion	0	0.0
Total	55	100.0

Table 17

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MOVEMENT

Impact of Movement on Student Learning	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Profound Positive Impact	5	9.1
Moderate Positive Impact	23	41.8
Slight Positive Impact	20	36.4
No Impact (Positive or Negative)	6	10.9
Slight Negative Impact	1	1.8
Moderate Negative Impact	0	0.0
Profound Negative Impact	0	0.0
No Opinion	0	0.0
Total	55	100.0

Table 18

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MOVEMENT

Extent to Which Superintendency Influenced Movement	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Superintendency was instrumental to success of movement	17	30.9
Superintendency contributed somewhat to success of movement	26	47.3
Superintendency did not influence movement (positively or negatively)	10	18.2
Superintendency was a negative influence on movement	0	0.0
No Opinion	2	3.6
Total	55	100.0

Table 19

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
THE GREAT REFORM MOVEMENT OF THE 1980s

Impact of Movement on Student Learning	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Profound Positive Impact	2	3.6
Moderate Positive Impact	11	20.0
Slight Positive Impact	25	45.5
No Impact (Positive or Negative)	8	14.5
Slight Negative Impact	4	7.3
Moderate Negative Impact	4	7.3
Profound Negative Impact	1	1.8
No Opinion	0	0.0
Total	55	100.0

Table 20

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
IN NEW YORK STATE
THE GREAT REFORM MOVEMENT OF THE 1980s

Extent to Which Superintendency Influenced Movement	Distribution of Responses	
	Number	Percent of Total
Superintendency was instrumental to success of movement	7	12.7
Superintendency contributed somewhat to success of movement	22	40.0
Superintendency did not influence movement (positively or negatively)	19	34.5
Superintendency was a negative influence on movement	4	7.3
No Opinion	3	5.5
Total	55	100.0

Table 21

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
COMPARISON OF MOVEMENTS
WITH PROFOUND OR MODERATE POSITIVE IMPACT

Movement	Percentage of Responses Indicating Profound or Moderate Impact
Comprehensive High School	67.3
Post Sputnik Emphasis on the Sciences	87.2
Discovery Approach	36.4
Programs for the Disadvantaged	70.9
Open Education	10.9
Back to Basics	36.4
Education of the Handicapped	89.1
Gifted and Talented	45.4
Effective Schools	50.9
Great Reform Movement of the 1980s	23.6

Table 22

A SURVEY OF
EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENTS
COMPARISON OF MOVEMENTS
WITH SLIGHT OR NO IMPACT

Movement	Percentage of Responses Indicating Slight or No Impact
Comprehensive High School	25.4
Post Sputnik Emphasis on the Sciences	11.0
Discovery Approach	61.8
Programs for the Disadvantaged	25.5
Open Education	89.1
Back to Basics	61.8
Education of the Handicapped	9.1
Gifted and Talented	54.6
Effective Schools	49.1
Great Reform Movement of the 1980s	76.4